

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 15 and 17 are amended and claims 18-19 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below; b) do not raise any new issues that require further search and/or consideration; and c) place the application in better form for an appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendment to claim 1 incorporates subject matter previously recited in dependent claims 18 and 19. The amendments to claims 7 and 15 are merely for clarity and are made based on comments in the Office Action. The other amendments are merely for clarity. Thus, no further search and/or consideration is necessary by the Examiner. Entry is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0035515 to Moreno. The Office Action also rejects claims 1, 2, 6-11 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 6,344,796 to Ogilvie. Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 3, 4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ogilvie in view of U.S. Patent 5,223,829 to Watabe. Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ogilvie in view of U.S. Patent 5,774,053 to Porter. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 7 and 15 each relate to features regarding the return of goods. More specifically, independent claim 1 recites a plurality of kiosks, where each kiosk has a data sending/receiving part connected to the server network for sending information of the

statement of the goods return as well as a plurality of goods custody parts for temporarily keeping the delivered or returned goods. Independent claim 1 further recites that each kiosk includes a sensor part and a controlling part, and in a returning process the sensor part determines that the goods are placed in the goods custody part and when the controlling part receives a request of a return of the goods, the controlling part transfers information of the goods to the server network.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. The Office Action then appears to state (on page 8) that Moreno discloses redelivery or return to the manufacturer or original sender. The Office Action references Moreno's paragraph #0094 (on page 10), paragraph #0105 (on page 11) and paragraph #0097. However, mere redelivery or return of goods does not teach or suggest the specific features of independent claim 1. In particular, there is no disclosure regarding the sending of information of the statement of goods return. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Moreno (and specifically the cited sections) for a sensor part and a controlling part. Similar features of the sensor part and controlling part were previously recited in dependent claims 18-19, but were not addressed in the Office Action. Additionally, the cited sections of Moreno do not relate to a returning process in which a sensor part determines that the goods are placed in a goods custody part and when the controlling part receives a request of the return of the goods, the controlling part transfers information of the goods to the server network. Moreno does not relate to a sensor part determining that goods are placed in the goods custody part and then a controlling part (during a returning) transfers

information of the goods to the server network. Merely because Moreno discloses return/redelivery of goods does not teach or suggest the specific features of independent claim 1.

The Office Action also references Ogilvie to show the features of independent claim 1. However, Ogilvie merely discloses (at column 2, lines 13-16, which is relied upon in the Office Action) that individuals can deposit outgoing goods for pickup. However, this does not teach or suggest the specific features of independent claim 1. That is, Ogilvie does not teach or suggest sending information on the statement of goods return as well as each kiosk including a sensor part and a controlling part. Furthermore, Ogilvie does not teach or suggest that in a returning process the sensor part determines that the goods are placed in the goods custody part and when the controlling part receives a request of a return of the goods, the controlling part transfers information of the goods to the server network.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Moreno and Ogilvie, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 7 recites requesting return of the goods through the kiosk installed at the place designated by the customer, where the requesting the return including: requesting to input at least one of customer information, goods receiving date and goods name; confirming the server network, which has sold the corresponding goods, based on the input information;

and transferring information of a statement of goods return and information of the place, where the corresponding kiosk is installed, to the confirmed server network.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Ogilvie and Moreno do not teach or suggest these features. Furthermore, based on comments made in the Office Action (on page 8), applicant has deleted the “if” from both claims 7 and 15. The Office Action also does not address the specific features regarding the requesting of return of goods. More specifically, Ogilvie and Moreno do not teach or suggest confirming the server network, which has sold the corresponding goods, based on the input information and transferring information of a statement of goods return and information of the place, where the corresponding kiosk is installed, to the confirmed server network. Merely because Moreno and Ogilvie disclose the possibility to return goods, there is no suggestion for these features including confirming a server network, and transferring information of a statement of goods return and information of the place to the confirmed server network. Accordingly, independent claim 7 defines patentable subject matter.

Furthermore, independent claim 15 recites requesting the customer to select a place to which the goods are returned when the customer requests the return of the goods through the acceptance part of the server network, transferring a statement of return of the corresponding goods to the kiosk installed at the place for the return of the goods when the place for the return of the goods is selected. Independent claim 15 further recites continuously confirming by the kiosk whether or not the corresponding goods are returned, based on the statement of return

received from the server network and notifying the fact that the corresponding goods are returned, from the kiosk to the server network when the corresponding goods are returned.

The outstanding Office Action does not specifically address all these features of independent claim 15. Furthermore, Ogilvie and Moreno do not teach or suggest requesting the customer to select a place to which the good are returned, transferring a statement of return of the corresponding goods to the kiosk, continuously confirming by the kiosk whether or not the corresponding goods are returned based on the statement of return from the server network and notifying the fact that the goods are returned from the kiosk to the server network. Accordingly, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 7 and 15 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 8-13 depend from claim 7 and claims 16-17 depend from claim 15 and therefore define patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims also recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

Still further, dependent claim 5 recites a temperature measuring sensor and a temperature controlling means operated for changing the inside temperature of the goods custody part measured by the temperature measuring sensor and the custody temperature of the inside of the goods custody part based on the kind of the goods kept in the goods custody part. Similarly, dependent claim 12 recites confirming a range of proper custody temperature of the goods when

the goods are foodstuffs and operating temperature controlling means for keeping the goods in custody within the range of proper custody temperature.

The applied references (including Porter) do not teach or suggest all the features of dependent claims 5 and 12. The Office Action states (on page 9) that Moreno discloses locker temperature control and that Porter discloses locker temperature control. However, dependent claims 5 and 12 recite features beyond mere temperature control. That is, claim 5 recites a temperature sensor for continuously sensing an inside temperature of the goods custody part and temperature controlling means operated for changing the inside temperature of the goods custody part measured by the temperature sensor and the custody temperature of the inside of the goods custody part based on the kind of the goods kept in the goods custody part. Further, dependent claim 12 includes operating temperature controlling means for keeping the goods in custody within the range of proper custody temperature. The Office Action has not addressed these specific features of dependent claims 5 and 12. Moreno and Porter do not relate to changing the temperature based on the kind of goods kept in the goods custody part. At best, these references may suggest a refrigerated embodiment, which does not relate to the control of temperature based on the kind of goods kept in the goods custody part. Dependent claims 5 and 12 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13 and 15-17 are


Serial No. 09/925,407
Reply to Office Action dated October 28, 2004

Docket No. K-0312

earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: January 26, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610